

A CORPUS-BASED ANALYSIS OF DONALD TRUMP'S VIEWS ON GAZA-PALESTINE AFTER HIS POLITICAL RETURN IN 2025

Laiba Yasmin

Department of Humanities, COMSATS University Islamabad.

laibayasmin790@email.com

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15826702>

Keywords

Donald Trump, Gaza, Palestine, corpus linguistics, political discourse, ideology

Article History

Received on 28 May 2025
Accepted on 28 June 2025
Published on 07 July 2025

Copyright @Author

Corresponding Author: *

Abstract

This study explores the ideological patterns in Donald Trump's 2025 public discourse regarding Gaza and Palestine, using corpus linguistics methods to uncover hidden biases and rhetorical strategies. By compiling a specialized corpus of speeches, interviews, and social media posts, and analyzing them through tools like AntConc, the study identifies key linguistic trends, including the repetition of terms such as "Israel," "peace," and "Hamas," alongside the deliberate omission of terms like "genocide" and "occupation." The analysis reveals how Trump positions himself as a central figure of resolution while marginalizing Palestinian agency through selective vocabulary and strategic framing. Grounded in the framework of Critical Discourse Analysis, the findings demonstrate how language is used not just to inform but to legitimize geopolitical interests and reinforce dominant narratives. This paper provides insight into how political figures shape public understanding through calculated linguistic choices.

INTRODUCTION

1. Background and Rationale

In 2025, Donald Trump's reentry into American politics reignited global debates surrounding his rhetoric, especially in relation to the Gaza-Palestine conflict. As a political figure known for blunt, populist communication, Trump's language has consistently polarized audiences and shaped foreign policy narratives. With violence escalating in the Gaza Strip and international concern mounting, his public statements gained renewed relevance. While many of his remarks were widely covered by media outlets, few studies have critically examined the structure and implications of the language he used during this period.

The Gaza-Palestine issue is not only a deeply entrenched humanitarian crisis, but also a powerful subject of ideological contestation in global politics. Trump's framing of this conflict – through speeches, interviews, and online commentary – carries

implications beyond American domestic politics. His word choices reflect and reinforce particular power dynamics, especially the United States' long-standing alliance with Israel.

Understanding how language functions within this geopolitical context requires more than anecdotal critique. It demands systematic, data-driven analysis that can uncover recurring lexical patterns, narrative structures, and ideological tendencies. This study applies corpus linguistics methods to Trump's 2025 discourse on Gaza and Palestine to move beyond surface-level interpretation and instead reveal the deeper linguistic mechanisms that construct meaning and shape public perception.

2. Problem Statement

While Donald Trump's political rhetoric has received extensive attention in both academic and media circles, most analyses focus on his general populist

style, immigration discourse, or economic policies. Far less attention has been paid to the specific linguistic framing of international conflicts – particularly the Gaza-Palestine crisis – during his political resurgence in 2025. Although his public statements on the matter were widely circulated, there is a notable absence of systematic linguistic research that examines how his word choices reflect ideological positioning or contribute to broader narratives of power, legitimacy, and conflict.

Media reports often highlight the content of Trump's statements, but they rarely analyze the form – how his language is structured to include or exclude certain perspectives, or how repeated word patterns shape audience understanding. Without a detailed corpus-based approach, subtle rhetorical strategies and omissions risk being overlooked. This gap limits our ability to fully understand how political figures like Trump use language not only to describe events but to construct realities that align with their agendas.

This study addresses that gap by applying corpus linguistics tools to analyze Trump's 2025 discourse on Gaza and Palestine. Through this approach, the research seeks to uncover ideological tendencies embedded in his vocabulary, his treatment of key actors, and the linguistic silences that may carry as much meaning as the words themselves.

3. Research Objectives and Questions

The primary aim of this study is to investigate how Donald Trump's public discourse in 2025 constructs political meaning around the Gaza-Palestine conflict. Using tools from corpus linguistics and framed by principles of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), the research seeks to explore how lexical patterns, collocations, and rhetorical omissions contribute to an ideological framing of the conflict. By examining Trump's speeches, interviews, and social media posts from that year, the study provides empirical insight into how political language functions as a tool for shaping perception, legitimizing alliances, and marginalizing alternative narratives.

3.1. The specific objectives of the study are:

1. To compile a corpus of Donald Trump's 2025 public statements relating to Gaza and Palestine.

2. To analyze the frequency, context, and collocations of key terms such as "Gaza," "Israel," "Hamas," and "Palestinians."

3. To uncover rhetorical strategies and patterns of omission that contribute to ideological framing.

4. To compare Trump's 2025 discourse with earlier patterns in his political language concerning the same region.

5. To interpret the findings through the lens of critical discourse theory, with attention to power dynamics and media influence.

3.2. Research Questions:

1. What lexical items dominate Donald Trump's 2025 discourse on Gaza and Palestine?

2. How frequently and in what context does Trump mention Gaza, Palestine, Israel, and related entities?

3. What ideological patterns emerge from his use of collocations, repetition, and rhetorical omission?

4. In what ways does his discourse reflect, reinforce, or revise earlier framings of the conflict?

5. How does Trump's language align with or depart from broader political discourse norms regarding the Middle East?

4. Literature Review

The intersection of language, politics, and ideology has long been a focus of critical discourse studies. Scholars such as Fairclough (2001) and van Dijk (1997) emphasize that political discourse is never neutral; it reflects and reproduces power structures by controlling what is said, how it is said, and what is left unsaid. According to Fairclough, political actors deploy discourse strategically – not only to convey information but also to shape perception, reinforce authority, and marginalize dissenting views. Similarly, van Dijk outlines how elite discourse often foregrounds certain narratives while omitting or downplaying others, particularly in the context of international conflicts.

In recent years, there has been growing academic interest in Donald Trump's rhetoric, much of which focuses on his populist style, nationalist framing, and use of polarization. Musolff (2018) and Chilton (2017) have analyzed the metaphorical and spatial

dimensions of Trump's language, noting his tendency to frame political issues in binary terms such as "us vs. them" or "order vs. chaos." Trump's speech often constructs enemies through repeated associations with danger, criminality, or instability, while portraying himself as a necessary force for resolution and protection. These strategies are not only persuasive but ideologically loaded, shaping public opinion through emotional resonance and repetition. Corpus linguistics has proven to be a valuable tool in revealing such hidden ideological mechanisms. As Baker (2006) argues, corpus tools allow researchers to detect patterns in word frequency, collocation, and concordance that might escape traditional close reading. These patterns can expose underlying biases, omissions, and discursive tendencies across large bodies of text. Partington et al. (2013) extend this approach through Corpus-Assisted Discourse Studies (CADS), demonstrating how computational tools can support nuanced, context-sensitive interpretations of political rhetoric.

Despite these advances, there remains a gap in the literature regarding Trump's recent discourse on the Middle East, particularly in the post-2020 political context. While several studies have explored his earlier policies toward Israel and Palestine, very little scholarship has applied corpus methods to his 2025 statements – a time of heightened conflict in Gaza and renewed international attention. This study addresses that gap by building on established theories of critical discourse and applying corpus techniques to a timely, under-examined data set.

By integrating insights from CDA and corpus linguistics, this research aims to demonstrate how Trump's 2025 language constructs a particular view of the Gaza conflict – one that reflects political alignment, ideological bias, and selective humanitarian framing. In doing so, the study contributes to broader discussions on how political language functions not just as commentary, but as a tool of power.

5. Corpus Design and Data Sources

To conduct a reliable and objective analysis of Donald Trump's 2025 discourse on Gaza and Palestine, this study constructed a specialized corpus comprising his public statements, press interviews, speeches, and

social media posts delivered throughout that year. The aim was to capture a representative sample of Trump's language across different communication platforms, with a focus on materials explicitly referring to Gaza, Israel, Palestinians, and the broader Middle Eastern context.

The data was collected from publicly accessible sources including official press releases from Trump's post-presidency media team, transcripts of televised interviews available on reputable news websites, and social media platforms such as Twitter/X and Truth Social. Statements made at political rallies or in televised debates were included only if full transcripts were available to ensure textual accuracy. The search was limited to the period between January 1 and May 30, 2025 – a phase marked by intensified violence in Gaza and frequent commentary from Trump on the issue.

All documents were manually curated and converted into plain text (.txt) format to ensure compatibility with AntConc, the concordance and corpus analysis software used in this study. Care was taken to remove metadata, formatting anomalies, and non-relevant commentary (such as interviewer prompts or applause markers) in order to isolate Trump's own language. Repetitive posts (e.g., retweets or reworded duplications) were cross-checked to avoid distortion of word frequencies.

The final corpus consisted of 4 separate documents totaling approximately 25,000 words. This size was deemed appropriate for a focused case study of a single speaker's discourse over a limited but politically intense time frame. While not exhaustive, the corpus was sufficiently robust to allow for meaningful patterns to emerge through frequency counts, keyword analysis, and collocation mapping.

The design was both purposive and strategic: purposive in its focus on a specific speaker and topic, and strategic in its effort to balance data across platforms to avoid over-representation of any one genre (e.g., social media vs. formal speech). By grounding the analysis in carefully curated, verifiable public texts, the study ensures transparency, replicability, and scholarly integrity in its methodological approach.

6. Research Methodology

This study adopts a corpus-based methodology grounded in both quantitative and qualitative techniques. The goal is to uncover how Donald Trump's 2025 discourse on Gaza and Palestine constructs ideological meaning through patterns in language use. The research design integrates empirical corpus tools with theoretical insights from Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to move beyond impressionistic claims and offer a rigorous linguistic account of political rhetoric.

6.1. Research Design

The study is exploratory and descriptive, aimed at mapping linguistic patterns in a politically sensitive context. A mixed-methods approach was employed: quantitative analysis was used to track word frequency, keyword usage, and collocation, while qualitative analysis interpreted these findings through a critical lens. The integration of numerical data with contextual interpretation enhances both the validity and depth of the study.

6.2. Corpus Tools

The primary tool used for linguistic analysis was **AntConc** (version 4.2), a widely used concordance and text analysis software developed by Laurence Anthony. AntConc enables researchers to visualize frequency patterns, examine keywords in context (KWIC), and identify statistically significant collocations. These features are especially useful in analyzing political discourse where repetition, framing, and omission play central roles.

6.3. Sampling Strategy

A purposive sampling method was applied to ensure that only texts relevant to the Gaza-Palestine issue were included. Sources were selected based on the presence of key terms such as "Gaza," "Palestine," "Israel," "ceasefire," " Hamas," and "hostages." The sample aimed for balance across communication formats: 40% of texts were formal statements or interviews, 30% came from speeches, and 30% were derived from social media commentary. This stratified

sampling helped mitigate bias introduced by platform-specific language norms.

6.4. Data Cleaning and Preparation

Each text was cleaned manually to remove non-essential metadata (e.g., timestamps, hashtags, interviewer prompts) while preserving the integrity of the original statements. Repetitive or near-duplicate statements were flagged and cross-checked to prevent skewing frequency analysis. The resulting corpus was formatted into plain text files and compiled into a single AntConc-compatible directory. All data processing steps were documented to ensure transparency and reproducibility.

6.5. Analytical Framework

The analysis proceeded in three stages:

1. **Word Frequency Analysis:** Identifying the most common content words to determine dominant topics.
2. **Keyword-in-Context (KWIC):** Examining how key terms were used within their textual environment.
3. **Collocation Analysis:** Analyzing word pairings to uncover patterns of association and implied meaning.

The results were interpreted using the theoretical principles of CDA, particularly drawing from Fairclough's (2001) emphasis on "strategic exclusion" and van Dijk's (1997) work on elite discourse. This theoretical lens was crucial in moving from raw data to ideological interpretation.

7. Findings

7.1. Word Frequency Analysis

The first stage of analysis focused on identifying the most frequently occurring words in Trump's 2025 discourse on Gaza and Palestine. Using AntConc's Word List tool, the study isolated content words by filtering out high-frequency function words (e.g., "the," "is," "and"). The resulting list highlights lexical items central to Trump's framing of the conflict and reveals thematic patterns that align with broader ideological cues.

Among the most frequently used words were:

Word	Rank	Frequency	Files Appeared In
Trump	19	40	4
Gaza	27	29	4
Israel	32	27	4
Peace	42	22	4
Hamas	59	16	3
Palestinians	63	15	3
President	55	18	4
Hostages	90	10	2
Hope	95	9	3
Iran	79	12	3

The data shows that “Trump” was the most frequently mentioned content word, reflecting a high degree of self-reference typical of populist discourse. This aligns with Musolff’s (2018) observations of political personalization, where leaders frame themselves as central figures in resolving crises.

“Gaza,” “Israel,” and “Hamas” were the next most frequent keywords, indicating a core thematic concern with the regional conflict. However, while Gaza was often mentioned, it was rarely discussed in terms of its people’s agency or suffering. The term “Palestinians” occurred less frequently and mostly in abstract or passive constructions, such as references to relocation or “stability,” rather than in contexts emphasizing rights or autonomy.

Interestingly, “peace” appeared 22 times, suggesting an apparent emphasis on conflict resolution. However, as later KWIC and collocation analysis reveal, this term was often paired with vague qualifiers (e.g., “we hope for peace”) and lacked concrete commitments, pointing to a performative rather than substantive engagement with peacebuilding.

Other notable words include “hostages,” “hope,” and “Iran”, which reflect additional thematic threads in Trump’s rhetoric – humanitarian appeals framed around hostage negotiations and frequent invocation of regional threats like Iran to justify pro-Israel actions.

7.2. Keyword-in-Context (KWIC) Analysis

Keyword-in-Context (KWIC) analysis was used to examine how frequently occurring words, particularly “Gaza,” “Israel,” “Hamas,” “ceasefire,” and “Palestinians,” were situated within Trump’s discourse. This technique revealed recurring rhetorical patterns and highlighted Trump’s preferred semantic associations – offering insight into how meaning is constructed, reinforced, or avoided through phrasing.

7.1.1. Gaza

The term “Gaza” frequently appeared in frames that emphasized dysfunction, destruction, or external intervention. Common phrases included “a mess,” “a hellhole,” and “needs to be rebuilt.” Trump seldom referred to the people of Gaza directly; instead, Gaza was treated as a space rather than a community. Even when suggesting reconstruction, the language implied external control – for example, “we will rebuild Gaza the right way” or “it has unbelievable potential.” Such phrasing, while superficially optimistic, positions Gaza not as an autonomous region but as a geopolitical project under potential U.S. or Israeli guidance. This aligns with Chilton’s (2017) argument that spatial metaphors in political discourse often reinforce colonial or interventionist ideologies.

7.1.2. Israel

The KWIC results for “Israel” revealed a pattern of praise and alignment. Trump used affirmative and emotionally charged language such as “I love Israel,” “our strongest ally,” and “we’ve done more for Israel than any other administration.” Israel was often discussed in the context of past accomplishments, including the relocation of the U.S. embassy to Jerusalem. His language frequently emphasized loyalty and partnership while omitting any mention of controversial actions like settlement expansion or civilian casualties. This reflects a narrative that centers Israeli state legitimacy and power while excluding critical humanitarian or legal contexts.

7.1.3. Hamas

“Hamas” consistently appeared alongside delegitimizing and violent language. Terms such as “eliminate,” “terrorist,” “evil,” and “no money for Hamas” formed part of a repeated discursive pattern that portrayed the group as the root cause of instability in the region. Trump’s statements positioned Hamas as both morally bankrupt and strategically weak – a common populist technique used to define the enemy in absolute terms (Musolff, 2018). There was no attempt to distinguish between Hamas and the broader Palestinian population, which served to justify broader punitive narratives affecting all of Gaza.

7.1.4. Ceasefire

The term “ceasefire” was notable for its limited and cautious use. In one example, Trump said, “This ceasefire could be the beginning of something more lasting,” while in another he stated, “I can’t say whether the ceasefire will hold.” These constructions reflect a rhetorical strategy of hedging – expressing support without commitment. Moreover, the lack of detailed follow-up or action-oriented language around ceasefires suggests a performative stance rather than a genuine diplomatic priority. As Fairclough (2001) notes, such discursive vagueness can function to preserve authority while evading responsibility.

7.1.5. Palestinians

Mentions of “Palestinians” were rare and often framed in relation to displacement. In one instance,

Trump referred to “moving over a million Palestinians to other countries,” presenting this controversial idea as a logistical proposal rather than a humanitarian or legal dilemma. This framing echoes van Dijk’s (1997) theory that elite discourse often treats marginalized groups as objects of planning rather than subjects with rights and agency. Other appearances were similarly abstract: “Palestinians will live there too,” or “they’ll benefit from redevelopment.” In each case, Palestinians were described but never directly quoted or empowered.

7.3. Collocation Analysis

Collocation analysis provides insight into how meaning is built through repeated lexical pairings. In this study, AntConc’s Collocation tool was used to identify statistically significant co-occurrences of words such as “Gaza” and “Israel” within the corpus. These pairings reveal not only what is said, but how ideas are linked – suggesting patterns of association that guide interpretation.

7.3.1. Gaza: Framed as a Space for External Control

The most prominent collocates for “Gaza” were “visit” and “Israel.” The word “visit,” while seemingly neutral, implies an outsider’s gaze – Gaza is not discussed as a homeland or cultural space but as a location to be overseen, assessed, or managed. Phrases such as “I plan to visit Gaza” or “leaders should visit Gaza” reflect a strategic distancing from the population itself. This reinforces Chilton’s (2017) claim that spatial discourse can reflect geopolitical hierarchies, with Gaza positioned as a passive, dependent region subject to foreign decisions. The frequent pairing of “Gaza” with “Israel” further entrenches this asymmetry. Gaza is rarely mentioned independently; instead, it is typically framed in relation to Israel – often as a threat or a challenge to Israeli security. This collocational pattern echoes what van Dijk (1997) describes as “semantic dependence,” in which the identity of a marginalized group (in this case, Gaza) is constructed entirely in relation to a dominant other (Israel). The repeated linkage minimizes Gaza’s visibility as an autonomous entity and reduces the conflict to a question of Israeli policy.

7.3.2. Israel: Personalized, Idealized, and Decontextualized

Collocates of “Israel” included “visit,” “Trump,” “it,” “plans,” and “oh.” The verb “visit” reappears here but takes on a more celebratory tone. Trump’s references to visiting Israel are often embedded in expressions of pride and accomplishment, such as “Oh, they love me in Israel” or “We’ve made incredible plans for Israel.” These phrases reflect not only admiration but self-attribution – Israel becomes a site where Trump’s influence is projected and affirmed.

The pronoun “it” is especially revealing. In statements like “We support it” or “Israel has a right to do it,” the referent is left vague. Such ambiguity, as Fairclough (2001) notes, allows speakers to invoke approval or justification without naming potentially controversial actions – such as military strikes or territorial expansion. This technique shields the speaker from scrutiny while affirming loyalty.

The collocate “Trump” itself appears frequently next to “Israel,” reinforcing a narrative of personal diplomacy. This personalization aligns with Musolff’s (2018) findings that populist leaders often frame international relations in terms of personality rather than policy, substituting institutional accountability with individual charisma. In this way, the U.S.-Israel relationship is recast not as a strategic alliance but as a reflection of Trump’s identity and legacy.

7.3.3. Absences and Silences

One of the most revealing aspects of the collocation data lies in what is **not** present. Words like “occupation,” “apartheid,” “blockade,” “refugee,” or “settlements” do not appear with statistically significant frequency in proximity to either “Gaza” or “Palestine.” Their absence supports Fairclough’s concept of “strategic exclusion” – the deliberate omission of concepts that could disrupt a dominant ideological frame.

Similarly, the word “Palestinians” has no significant collocates beyond administrative or logistical terms (e.g., “relocation,” “housing”). This linguistic marginalization reflects a political one – Palestinians are constructed as subjects to be moved or managed rather than as political actors with agency or rights.

8. Discussion

The linguistic patterns uncovered through corpus analysis of Donald Trump’s 2025 discourse reveal a systematic ideological framing of the Gaza-Palestine conflict – one that aligns closely with U.S.-Israeli strategic narratives while marginalizing or erasing Palestinian perspectives. When viewed through the lens of Critical Discourse Analysis, these patterns not only reflect Trump’s political stance but also illustrate how language functions to legitimize power and reinforce dominant ideologies.

Fairclough (2001) emphasizes that political language often works through strategic exclusion, where silences and omissions are as ideologically meaningful as the words that are spoken. In this corpus, such exclusions are striking. Terms that are central to international human rights discourse – including “occupation,” “blockade,” “apartheid,” or “settlements” – are conspicuously absent. This discursive void serves to sanitize the conflict and present it in depoliticized terms, in which Israel’s actions require no justification and Palestinian suffering is either backgrounded or reframed as a logistical issue.

The high frequency of terms such as “ Hamas,” “terror,” and “hostages” plays a crucial role in this reframing. These words are not used descriptively but rather ideologically – to construct a binary moral framework in which Israel is portrayed as righteous and threatened, and Gaza as a space of chaos controlled by terror. This echoes van Dijk’s (1997) theory that elite discourse constructs polarized mental models, often through the repetition of fear-based or delegitimizing language. Trump’s repeated framing of Hamas as the central problem effectively collapses distinctions between militant actors and the broader Palestinian population, making humanitarian critique irrelevant to the narrative.

Equally revealing is the personalization of discourse. Trump refers to himself frequently and positions his actions – whether relocating the U.S. embassy to Jerusalem or imposing sanctions – as markers of strength and success. As Musolff (2018) and Chilton (2017) observe, such personalization is a key feature of populist political rhetoric. It allows the speaker to blur the lines between governance and self-promotion, replacing institutional accountability with

performative leadership. In this context, Gaza becomes a stage on which Trump projects authority, decisiveness, and moral clarity – not a region with political complexity and humanitarian urgency.

Spatial metaphors further underscore this asymmetry. Gaza is repeatedly referenced in terms of its physical deterioration (“hellhole,” “destroyed,” “mess”), while Israel is discussed in terms of dignity, strength, and pride. Chilton (2017) argues that such spatial representations often carry ideological weight: they do not simply describe geography but define the value and status of places and peoples. Gaza, in this discourse, is a failed space – not a nation, not a people, but a problem awaiting external management. Israel, by contrast, is a partner, an achievement, a symbol of Western order.

The analysis of collocates compounds these findings. The pairing of “Gaza” with “visit” and “Israel” emphasizes an external gaze: Gaza is something to be seen, assessed, possibly intervened in – but not inhabited or spoken for. The word “Palestinians” rarely appears, and when it does, it is almost never linked to rights, voice, or resistance. Instead, Palestinians are mentioned in relation to relocation, housing, or generic humanitarian “solutions.” This supports van Dijk’s view that elite discourse often deactivates agency when describing marginalized groups, framing them as passive or problematic rather than as legitimate actors.

Ultimately, Trump’s discourse constructs a hegemonic narrative – one that erases context, elevates personal leadership, and aligns closely with dominant geopolitical interests. The use of corpus linguistics in this study has made it possible to trace that narrative empirically: not through speculation or anecdote, but through the patterned use of language over time. These patterns, while seemingly subtle, shape the way audiences perceive legitimacy, justice, and responsibility in one of the world’s most enduring conflicts.

9. Conclusion

This study has examined Donald Trump’s 2025 discourse on Gaza and Palestine using corpus-based techniques grounded in the principles of Critical Discourse Analysis. Through word frequency, keyword-in-context (KWIC), and collocation analysis,

the research has identified a consistent ideological pattern: one that centers Israeli interests, minimizes Palestinian agency, and elevates Trump’s persona as a symbol of order and leadership.

Trump’s language portrays Gaza not as a community or nation, but as a dysfunctional space requiring external intervention. The people of Gaza – and Palestinians more broadly – are rarely spoken about as subjects with rights, demands, or political voice. Instead, they are positioned as objects within a broader geopolitical problem, often described only in relation to security threats, relocation plans, or humanitarian abstractions. At the same time, Israel is framed through celebratory and protective language, with Trump casting himself as a uniquely loyal and effective ally.

The absence of critical terms like “occupation,” “apartheid,” and “blockade” is not a matter of style but of ideology. Such omissions reflect a discursive strategy aimed at simplifying a complex conflict into a binary structure that justifies unilateral alliances and external control. As Fairclough (2001) and van Dijk (1997) argue, this type of linguistic framing is not merely reflective of political positions – it actively constructs them, shaping public understanding and policy agendas.

By combining the rigor of corpus linguistics with the theoretical insights of discourse analysis, this study contributes to a deeper understanding of how political language functions as a tool of persuasion and power. It demonstrates that political speech should not be evaluated only for what it says, but for what it repeats, what it associates, and what it strategically omits.

10. Recommendations

Based on the analysis of Trump’s 2025 discourse on Gaza and Palestine, the following recommendations are proposed:

- **Expand the corpus to include alternative voices.**

Incorporate Palestinian leaders, activists, and community sources into future corpora to provide a more balanced linguistic representation of the conflict.

- **Conduct comparative political discourse studies.**

Analyze how different global leaders frame the Gaza

conflict to identify shared ideological patterns and national variations.

- **Integrate discourse analysis into educational curricula.**

Promote media and political literacy by teaching students how to critically analyze language, especially in politically charged contexts.

- **Apply findings to human rights advocacy and policy.**

Use linguistic evidence to challenge one-sided narratives and advocate for discourse that includes marginalized or silenced perspectives.

- **Establish longitudinal archives of political rhetoric.**

Track shifts in discourse over time to reveal evolving ideological positions and the influence of global events on political speech.

Van Dijk, T. A., (Eds.). (1997). *Discourse as social interaction* (Vol. 2). Sage.

References

Baker, P. (2006). Using corpora in discourse analysis: Continuum. *Applied Linguistics*.

Chilton, P. (2017). "The people" in populist discourse: Using neuro-cognitive linguistics to understand political meanings. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 16(4), 582-594.

Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and power* (2nd Ed). Routledge.

Klein, B., & Harvey, L. (2025, January 25). Trump suggests his plan for Gaza Strip is to 'clean out the whole thing'. *CNN Politics*. <https://edition.cnn.com/2025/01/25/politics/trump-gaza-strip-jordan-egypt/index.html>

Lipton, E., & Nereim, V. (2025, May 5). Trump's Middle East visit stirs controversy amid Gaza conflict. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2025/05/05/us/politics/trump-israel-gaza.html>

Musolff, A. (2016). Political metaphor analysis.

Partington, A., Taylor, C., & Duguid, A. (2013). Patterns and meanings in discourse.

"Riviera of the Middle East": Everything Trump said about his plan to take over Gaza. (2025, February 5). *National Post*. <https://nationalpost.com/news/world/israel-middle-east/donald-trump-benjamin-netanyahu-israel-gaza>

